Remarks

It is respectfully requested that claims 34 - 66 be reconsidered for allowance in view of this Amendment and these Remarks.

The Specification and Abstract have been replaced by a substitute Specification and Abstract. The substitute Specification includes the headings requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form with respect to multiple dependencies. Accordingly, claims 1-33 are cancelled and new claims 34-66 are added with corrected dependencies and the elimination of multiple dependencies. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 1-33 were objected to for informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-33 are cancelled and new claims 34-66 are added to correct these informalities. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Accordingly, new claims 34-66 have been added to more accurately define the present invention, and to correct the problems identified by the Examiner with respect to claims 2 and 6, now new claims 35 and 39, respectively. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 - 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 1 - 4 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 5 - 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, new claims 34-66 have been added to more accurately define the present invention.

In particular, new claim 34 recites that a controller is connected to the turbocharger, and that the controller controls turbocharger geometry to increase air pressure when filling the tire.

Considering the state of the art Tarasinski, Schmidt et al., and Gerke et al., there is no hint concerning an improvement of the tire filling process by increasing the charged air pressure by variation of the geometry of the turbocharger. Moreover Schmidt ('146) only solves the divergent problem of the optimization of the braking performance of a supercharged internal-combustion engine by adjusting the variable geometry of a turbocharger. Further, Gerke ('984) applies to the optimization of the combustion efficiency of an internal combustion engine by using an improved turbocharger arrangement. Thus, new claim 34 should be allowed.

Claims 35 - 66 should be allowed because they now depend directly or indirectly from allowable new claim 34.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525.

Respectfully,

/Joel S. Carter, Reg. # 29,368/

Joel S. Carter

Attorney for Applicant

Joel S. Carter
Deere & Company
Patent Department
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
(309) 765-4045